



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

what he chooses (with most Roman Catholic writers) to call a *real* presence, which is, however, quite a distinct thing from his own doctrine of a *corporal* one.

"While the Jews understood our Saviour to speak of really intending to give them his flesh to eat, if they were wrong, can we suppose him to answer them by saying, that his flesh was *really* meat? Or can we, under these circumstances, imagine him to use the word at all, and that twice and emphatically? for the repetition of it in the two members of the sentence forms a true emphasis, unless he wished to be taken literally. If so, there is no other conclusion to be drawn from the sentence, than that he was speaking of a real eating of his flesh and drinking his blood."—*Lectures on the Real Presence*, p. 121.

It is clear now, that if the note of the Douay Bible be right, Cardinal Wiseman is wrong, both in his argument and in the fact on which it rests. This note, and the Roman Catholic bishops who sanctioned it, are at direct issue with him on the fact of the interpretation put, and intended by our Lord (according to the Cardinal) to be put upon His words.

It seems barely possible that Dr. Wiseman has never read this note, or, having read, forgot its existence. Otherwise the inference must be, that in this estimate of the superior value of his own judgment, he overlooked the evidence which this contradiction would furnish, of the slight respect which he attached to the judgment of his brother prelates, or the notes of a Bible used by the members of his communion, when they stood in the way of his arguments.

We can furnish our Roman Catholic brethren with another, and a very recent instance of disagreement among their prelates.

By a minute of the proceedings of the Board of National Education, held 8th July, 1853, "it is ordered that—The lessons on the truth of Christianity be withdrawn from the list of books published by direction of the Commissioners."

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, in pamphlet just published upon the occasion of this present breach of faith with the public, makes the following statement with respect to this work, excluded by the votes (among others) of Roman Catholic bishops:—It was "not at all less the work of Archbishop Murray than ours; for he, as well as the rest of the Commissioners, deliberately recommended it. He perused it with scrupulous care, and he sent over a copy to the late Pope, who had it read to him in Italian, and found it unexceptionable." Again, with respect to "the Scripture Lessons," Mr. Carlile, in a letter recently addressed to the editor of the *Times*, thus speaks—"With regard to the two Archbishops, no half sheet was ever sent to press without their express authority."

"These Scripture Lessons were prepared, not only with the assent, but at the express wish of Dr. Murray and the other Roman Catholic members of the board, for the very purpose of being used in the common instruction, and every half sheet was signed by Dr. Murray with that view, except a few when he was from home, which were signed by a clergyman authorized by him to do so."

This book, thus deliberately sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop, met (as well as Dr. Murray himself) "with violent attacks," to use Mr. Carlile's words, from Dr. M' Hale, and was at last placed in the *Index Expurgatorius*.

We do earnestly press upon our Roman Catholic countrymen to consider these evidences of the respect which the prelates of their church pay to the deliberate judgments of their episcopal brethren. We put the matter in this way, because it is certain that infallibility is, and cannot, for uneducated people, be anything else ultimately, than the judgments of their bishop or priest. The decrees of councils, &c., are to them just what they are told of them. Upon the personal judgments of their own bishop or priest, they must ultimately rest. But if they do so, in defiance of the evidences which these same persons (and not Protestants) give of the slight respect which they pay to each other, we must ask them to consider whether they are acting more wisely than the poor Irishman, who, having been told something about a sun-dial, went out at night with a candle to see the hour, and came back complaining that he could make nothing at all out of it, for the shadow moved whatever way he looked at it.

Now, the infallibility of the Church is to our thousands of uneducated Roman Catholic countrymen, just what the shadow of the sun-dial was to the poor Irishman, with the priest or bishop for the candle, as fluctuating as the time shown by the perpetually shifting shadow.

IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE A CORRUPT AND MUTILATED TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?

We have to consider now the other chief difference between the Douay and Protestant Bible—viz., the use of the word "priest."

Dr. Ward, in his "Errata," pages 46 and 46, brings forward six passages, all relating to the Christian ministry, in all which places, in the Douay Bible, they are called priests, whereas in the Protestant Bible they are called elders. Of course Dr. Ward counts this a wilful corruption

in the Protestant Bible. We give Dr. Ward's objection in his own words (p. 45):—"The English Protestants, on purpose to abolish the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, did not only take away the word *altar* out of the Scripture, but they also suppressed the name *priest* in all their translations, turning it into *elder*; well knowing that these three—priest, sacrifice, and altar—are dependents and consequents one of another, so that they cannot be separated. If there be an external sacrifice, there must be an external priesthood to offer it, and an altar to offer the same upon." And, again—"But our new pretended reformers have made the Scriptures quite dumb as to the name of any such priest or priesthood as we now speak of; never so much as once naming *priest*, unless where mention is made either of the priests of the Jews or the priests of the Gentiles."

Dr. Ward has here very accurately stated the importance of this difference. There cannot be a sacrifice without a priest. If the ministers of the Gospel are not priests, they cannot offer any sacrifice, and, therefore, there can be no Sacrifice in the Mass; but if they be priests, then they must offer sacrifice, which, of course, is to be looked for in the Mass. We think Dr. Ward quite right in this view of the importance of the difference in question between the two Bibles. The thing we have to consider is simply, whether it be a true or a false translation to put in *priests* in the passages in question. We ask our readers to consider the evidence, and to remember how much depends on it.

The Jewish religion, that which Moses gave to the people of Israel, consisted chiefly in offering animals in sacrifice to God. By God's direction, Moses set apart a class of men to offer these sacrifices. The name given to this class of men in the Greek Old Testament is *ἱερεὺς* (*hiereus*). By this name they are invariably called. There was also another class of men among the Jews, to whom the name of *πρεσβύτερος* (*presbyteros*) was given: these were they who had any office or authority among them, but who had not power to offer sacrifice. These men were never called *hiereus*—that name was confined to those who offered sacrifice, and the name *presbyteros* was never applied to those who offered sacrifice.

In the Greek New Testament those who offered sacrifice among the Jews are **ALWAYS** called *hiereus*, **NEVER** *presbyteros*; and the ministers of the Christian religion are **ALWAYS** called *presbyteros*, **NEVER** *hiereus*. This is the fact. The Apostles and Evangelists who were inspired by God to write the New Testament, **NEVER** called the ministers of the Gospel *hiereus*, which meant one who offered sacrifice; but **ALWAYS** called them *presbyteros*, which meant one who did **NOT** offer sacrifice. They had their choice of the two names; both names were in common use among the Jews—one meaning a person who offered sacrifice, the other meaning a public officer who did not offer sacrifice; and they **ALWAYS** called the ministers of the Gospel by that name which did **not** mean sacrificers. Wherever the writers of the New Testament speak of the Jewish priests, they **always** used the word *hiereus*; wherever they spoke of the ministers of Christ, they **always** used the word *presbyteros*. And they did this by direction of the Holy Ghost, the spirit by which they wrote. That Holy Spirit taught them always carefully to distinguish those two orders of men by two different names, having quite different meanings.

Now, what is the difference between the two Bibles, the Douay and the Protestant?

The Douay Bible insists that the two different classes which the Holy Ghost directed the Apostles to distinguish so carefully, by two different names, shall always be called *by the same name, in the same meaning*. The Protestant Bible is careful to distinguish them by words of different meaning. Which is right? We think this a question which any plain man may answer.

The Douay Bible is the more inexcusable in this, because the Latin translation of the New Testament, which the Douay translators professed to follow, set them the example of carefully following the distinction made in the Greek. Wherever the Greek has *hiereus*, the Latin always puts *sacerdos*; and wherever the Greek has *presbyteros*, the Latin has *presbyterus*. So here is the marked distinction kept up in the Latin as well as in the Greek; and yet, the Douay Bible insists, that no distinction at all shall be observed in the English; while the Protestant Bible preserves the distinction exactly. And it is simply for following the Greek, and the Latin too, that Dr. Ward attacks it, and calls it corrupt! In all the six passages which Dr. Ward has produced, the Greek has *presbyteros*, and the Latin, *presbyterus*; and yet, the Douay Bible translates it as if the Greek had *hiereus*, and the Latin, *sacerdos*.

It is wholly false to speak of the Protestant Bible (as Dr. Ward does in the passage above quoted) as "never so much as once naming *priest*, unless when mention is made either of the priests of the Jews, or the priests of the Gentiles." In eight different places of the 5th, 7th, 8th, and 10th chapters of Hebrews, the word "priest" is applied in the Protestant Bible to Christ Himself.

This leads us to observe another marked distinction in the Greek and Latin Bibles, which the Douay Bible wilfully abolishes. Christ himself is called *hiereus* in the Greek, and *sacerdos* in the Latin, and never *presbyteros*.

* The literal meaning of the word *πρεσβύτερος* is "one advanced in years." It came to be applied to persons in any public office, because men of years and experience were generally chosen for such situations. Hence it appears how correct and appropriate is the English translation, "elder."

His ministers are called *presbyteros*, and never *sacerdos*, or *hiereus*.

Thus both the Greek and the Latin Bibles carefully distinguish the office of Christ and the office of his ministers by different names, having quite different meanings; and yet the Douay Bible insists on confounding those separate offices, under the same name, in the same meaning! and because the Protestant Bible does not follow their example, in opposition both to the Greek, and to that Latin Bible which the Council of Trent pronounces "authentic," they accuse it of corrupting the Word of God!

The Protestant Bible has also the word "priest" or "priesthood" in five places, where it is evidently applied to all Christ's people—viz., 1 Peter ii. 5 and 9; Revelation, or Apocalypse, i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6. *In all instances*, following the same rule, translating *hiereus* by *priest*, wherever they meet with it, and *presbyteros* by *elder*; so as always to make the same distinction between the offices, which they find marked so strongly in the Greek and Latin Bibles: whereas, the Douay Bible confounds and abolishes that distinction altogether.

We wish to point out carefully that it is not about the **sound** of words that we would contend, but about the distinction of offices. If it were kept in view in a translation of the Bible, that the Jewish ministers and Christian ministers are distinguished in the Greek Scriptures by different names, which have different meanings, one expressing the offering of sacrifices, and the other excluding that notion—if this were marked in the translation, as it is in the original—then we would not object to the word "priest" being put as the translation of *presbyteros*, provided it were understood that it was used as the translation of a Greek word that does **not** mean one who offers sacrifice, and provided some other word were used for the Jewish priests, who did offer sacrifice. What we maintain is this, that where the two offices are clearly distinguished in the original by two names, having clearly different meanings, that distinction should be made plain in the translation too. To put that distinction altogether out of the translation, as the Douay Bible does, by always giving the same name, in the same meaning, to the two different offices, is a wilful corrupting and confounding of the Word of God.

And why does the Douay Bible thus wilfully confound what God's Word has distinguished?

Dr. Ward has told us, in the passage above quoted, without a priest there can be no Sacrifice of the Mass. Let it once be known among Christians now, (as it was clearly known in the Apostles' days) that the Apostles were careful always to call Christ's ministers by a title which meant one who did **not** offer sacrifice, and that they never called them by the title of the Jewish priests who did offer sacrifice; let this striking distinction made by the Apostles once be known, and then the Sacrifice of the Mass falls of itself. And therefore to establish her own sacrifice, the Church of Rome has no resource but to abolish and hide that distinction which the Apostles made between the Jewish and Christian ministers. Is not this enough in itself to disprove their sacrifice?

We do not deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in **any** sense at all. There are sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving (Hebrews, xiii. 15); and all Christians are priests to offer such sacrifices as these—(1 Pet. ii. 5, 9).* In this sense the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice, and the highest sacrifice that Christians can offer. But this is not the **Sacrifice** of the Mass, for it is not a sacrifice of propitiation for sin. It is not the same kind of sacrifice as the Jewish sacrifices for sin, or the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Neither does it require any other kind of sacrificing power in the priest, than what all Christ's people possess.

We trust we have shown that the Protestant Bible does right in distinguishing between *hiereus* and *presbyteros*; and that the Douay Bible does wrong in confounding them. We trust the time may come when the Douay Bible will be corrected in this matter too by the Protestant Bible.

In our next number we will conclude this subject, by considering whether the books called *Apocrypha* are really part of the Bible given by inspiration of God.

CAN THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME BE PROVED FROM ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND THE WRITINGS OF THE EARLIER FATHERS?

NO. II.

In our last number we made some general observations on the uncertainty which attaches to the dogma of infallibility, and the novelty of the modern Roman Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Church of Rome. We proceed now to establish the latter position more in detail, and our proofs shall be derived, as we proposed, from the history of the Church and the writings of the Fathers.

Now, in order to avoid confounding things which are in themselves distinct, it must be carefully borne in mind that the infallibility of the Church of Rome does not necessarily follow from its supremacy, supposing the latter to be admitted. A spiritual supremacy over all other Churches may have been accorded to one Church, without, in the remotest degree, inferring as a consequence the attribute of infallibility. Romish theologians, however, often seem to think that they have only to establish the former

* Of course we do not mean that laymen can celebrate the Eucharist. Consecration is confined to Presbyters.

privilege in favour of their Church, and that the latter must follow as a necessary result.

But whilst it is true that the concession of supremacy does not necessarily imply the recognition of infallibility, it is equally true that the recognition of the latter must necessarily lead to the concession of the former. Had the Church of Rome, or any other Church, been supposed to be endowed with the Divine attribute of infallibility, it must necessarily follow that every other Church would acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of that one in which so pre-eminent a gift was lodged. It becomes, therefore, a matter of importance for us to show that the spiritual supremacy of the Church of Rome was not generally acknowledged in any such sense as the admitted claim to infallibility would imply. Now, this has been unansweredably shown by many Protestant writers, especially by Barrow, in his "Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy." Whence we conclude that the claim to infallibility was either not made or not allowed, so long, at least, as the claim to supremacy was disputed. Our argument, in short, is the following—If infallibility were supposed to reside in the Church of Rome in ancient times, the supremacy of that Church would also have been recognised. But its supremacy was not recognised. Therefore, infallibility was not supposed to reside in it.

We have said that the fact of the non-recognition of the spiritual supremacy of Rome for many ages has been amply proved by Barrow and other writers. To their works, therefore, we, for the present, refer those who wish for a full discussion of the whole subject. We shall content ourselves with noticing a few of the more prominent points connected with it.

Among the arguments adduced by Roman Catholic writers in proof of the acknowledged supremacy of the Church of Rome in early times, none is urged with greater frequency or more confidence than that which they derive from a well-known passage of Irenaeus, the famous Bishop of Lyons at the close of the second century. We shall show that this passage of Irenaeus, when properly understood, lends no countenance to the conclusion which is so confidently drawn from it.

In his work on Heresy (Book iii., ch. 3), Irenaeus, after describing the Church of Rome as "founded by the two most glorious apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul," then adds—"Ad hanc Ecclesiam, propter potentiorum principiatis, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam—hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles—in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea qua est ab Apostolis traditio." Here, it is insisted by Roman Catholic divines, is a plain acknowledgment, on the part of one of the most eminent bishops of the primitive Church, of the supremacy of the Church of Rome—an unequivocal declaration that every Church "must conform to the Church of Rome, on account of its more powerful principality." To see whether this inference be sustainable, let us examine for a moment the scope and context of Irenaeus' words. He is disputing against heretics. Having first refuted them by reference to Scripture, he then proceeds to the testimony against them furnished by the Catholic Church. But how was this testimony to be procured? "It would," as he says himself, "be very tedious to enumerate the episcopal successions of all the Churches of Christendom." He prefers to select some one Church as a specimen and type of all the rest. As he was writing in the West, it was most natural that he should select a western Church; a Church generally acknowledged to have been founded by Apostles; a Church founded by the two most illustrious of the Apostles, Peter and Paul; a Church the succession of whose bishops was well authenticated and generally known; in short, the Church of Rome. He then introduces the passage which we have quoted above—"Ad hanc Ecclesiam, &c." Unfortunately, this passage is preserved to us only through the medium of an old Latin version of Irenaeus' work. The original Greek words are not extant.

The divines of the Church of Rome, as we have already said, interpret these words to signify that "it is necessary for every Church to conform to this Church"—i.e., to the Church of Rome; and they accordingly insist that a moral obligation rests upon all men to submit to her authority.

That this interpretation is not correct appears from the following considerations:—First, it is at variance with the drift of Irenaeus' argument. His object is to refute heresies by appealing to the testimony of the universal Church. As an exponent of that testimony he selects one Church—the Church of Rome. That this selection was a fair one, and might be regarded as virtually collecting the evidence of all the Churches, he shows by reminding his readers that the Church of Rome had been founded by the two most glorious Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, from whom the succession of bishops might be certainly traced, and whose names he himself enumerates.

This being so, the words, "ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam," cannot mean that every Church, then and for ever after, must submit to the Church of Rome. Were that so, Irenaeus would never have said that, "because it would be tedious to appeal to all churches," he would, therefore, appeal to one Church—the Church of Rome. Such a statement would have had no

meaning, if Rome had been admittedly supreme over all churches, so that all churches were bound to agree with her. It would be manifestly absurd of anybody to say—It would be a tedious process to ascertain the opinions of all the peers of the realm: we will, therefore, appeal to the crown.

This sense of the original words of Irenaeus being, therefore, excluded, we have next to inquire what they did mean. Most clearly this:—That on account of the more august antiquity of Rome—for such is the significance of the words "poterior principiatis"—it must follow of course (*necesse est*) that every Church—that is, all believers who exist in all places (*undique*)—will agree with her, and be represented by her; or, in other words, every Church (Irenaeus says) in which (*in qua*) the tradition from the Apostles has been preserved by those who exist everywhere (i.e., by Catholics, as opposed to heretics, who existed only in particular places), must naturally agree with the apostolic Church of Rome. Thus he shows that his reference to Rome is justifiable; and that by appealing to that Church he has virtually appealed to all orthodox churches, whose testimony may be supposed to be embodied and involved in hers.

But not only does Irenaeus in this passage not countenance the doctrine of Papal supremacy, as taught by the Romish divines, but he, in fact, by implication, overthrows the foundation on which they make it and the kindred doctrine of infallibility to rest.

These doctrines they base on the words of our Lord to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 18) "On this rock I will build my Church," maintaining that the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter as the rock of the church; but Irenaeus refers to the Church of Rome, as founded by the two most glorious apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; and he, moreover, enumerates the Bishops of Rome who succeeded Linus, who, he says, was first placed in that See by the same two apostles. This is a striking and most convincing proof that he knew nothing of the Romish theory which claims infallibility and supremacy for St. Peter alone, as head of the Church, and also claims the same prerogatives for the Bishops of Rome, as successors of St. Peter.

We do not (as we before observed) possess the original Greek of Irenaeus in the passage first considered. We have only an old, and evidently a very literal, Latin version of it. From this version we have endeavoured, faithfully and honestly, to elicit the true meaning of the original; and we have concluded that Irenaeus was totally ignorant of the lofty claims now set up for the Church of Rome. A recently discovered work of Hippolytus, a scholar of Irenaeus, who had the original Greek before him, and had the advantage of personal intercourse with the writer, enables us to ascertain how he understood the passage. To this very remarkable work of Hippolytus we accordingly propose to direct attention in our next number. Meanwhile, we will conclude the present article with a notice of a passage of Tertullian, who flourished in the early part of the third century—a passage which, although cited by Roman Catholic writers in support of the claims of their Church to supremacy and infallibility, directly militates against such claims.

In his work *De Prescriptione Haereticorum*, Tertullian refutes heretics by a line of argument similar to that of Irenaeus, above described—namely, appealing to the doctrine preserved in the apostolic churches of highest character and most unquestioned succession of bishops. "Run over" (he says, ch. 36) "the Apostolic Churches in which the very chairs of the apostles still preside in their own places, in which their (i.e., the apostles') authentic letters are still read, uttering the words and representing the face of each. Is Achaia," he adds, "next to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou canst go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus: But if thou art adjacent to Rome, thou hast Rome, where authority is at hand to us (i.e., the African Church) also."

Now, it is very remarkable that, in quoting this passage, Roman Catholic writers (e.g., Messrs. Berington and Kirk) take care to omit altogether the words relating to Corinth

* *Principiatis*, in the old Latin translation of Irenaeus, is used for priority of time, and is opposed to *posterioritas*. The words used by Irenaeus were probably *ἰκανωτέρας ἀρχαίτητη*. In this same chapter the translator has rendered *ἰκανωτάτη* by *potentissima*. The Church of Rome was the only Western Church that was known to have been founded by Apostles. It had, accordingly, a "poterior principiatis," a more "powerful or august principiatis."

Again, as the old Latin version is a literal one (as appears from the comparison of it with the Greek in those passages in which the Greek has been preserved), it is almost certain that when the translator used "necesse est," Irenaeus wrote *ἀνάγκη*. Now, this word *ἀνάγκη*, as is well known, frequently implies a reasonable or necessary inference, and not a moral obligation. Thus, for instance, when the ecclesiastical historian Theodoret says (iv. 5) *ἀνθρώπους ἀνάγκη προστητεῖν δύτας*, he certainly does not intend to assert that it is a moral duty for a man to transgress; but his meaning is that it is a natural consequence of his fallen condition—"hunc manum est errare."

+ *Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipse adhuc cathedraliter recitantur, sonantes vocem et representantes faciem uniuscuiusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiam, adjaces habes Romam, unde nolis quoque auctoritas prestat est.*

and Ephesus, retaining only those which refer to Rome. The reason is obvious. The unmutilated words of Tertullian not only prove nothing in support of the supremacy and infallibility of Rome, but are actually inconsistent with such claims, as they speak of Ephesus and Corinth in exactly the same way as they do of Rome itself. The Church of Corinth, which enjoyed the teaching of the Apostle Paul, was to be appealed to by those who happened to be near Achaia. The Church of Ephesus, over which the Apostle John had presided, was to be appealed to by those who could visit Asia Minor. And by those who were adjacent to Italy—as were, for example, the African Christians, to whom Tertullian himself belonged—Rome was to be appealed to, as having been founded by at least one Apostle, and, perhaps, by two, and, moreover, being the only apostolical Church in Western Christendom.

It will be observed further that one of the grounds, on which Tertullian rests this appeal to the Apostolic Churches, is nearness of time to the apostolic age (*apud quos ipse adhuc cathedralis Apostolorum suis locis praeſident*). So that the force of this appeal would be gradually diminished in the course of time, and would ultimately be altogether lost.

THE MARLEYS.

CHAPTER III.

AFTER the scene which we detailed in our last, and the promise of Edith and Adeline to attend before the bishop, they awaited with fear and trembling the approach of the following Saturday, which was fixed for the interview. It was an encounter from which they would have shrunk in circumstances less cogent than those under which their consent had been extorted. The interval they spent between prayer and preparation—prayer for wisdom and strength, and preparation to answer a wise and learned bishop of the Church of Rome—to answer him concerning the faith which they held dearer than life itself. While conning over the plain simple texts of Scripture, which were the only weapons of their warfare, and treasuring them up in their memories, they felt like David with his pebbles and his sling going forth to meet the giant of the Philistines. They knew their own feebleness and puny strength, but their comfort was that the Angel of the Lord (Jesus Christ himself) encampeth round about those that fear him.

Early on Saturday morning, Edith and Adeline drove in, in company with their sister Marcella, to the bishop's house. They were shown in directly to his study, and a venerable, mild, and kindly old man came forward and greeted them in an affectionate and cordial manner. The bishop opened the conversation about some indifferent matters, which he discussed with a good-natured playfulness, so graceful and condescending in advanced age, when addressing itself to early youth. From these subjects he gradually approached that of some church commemoration for the following day, and then said—

"My dear children, I believe you wished to consult me about some matters which you find difficult to understand, and desired to have an explanation of, and nothing can give me greater pleasure than to remove any doubts from your minds, and enable you to enjoy the blessedness of a full and free communion with the Holy Catholic Church."

To this Edith and Adeline scarcely knew what answer to give, they were reluctant to open an attack, and to commence hostilities, and were rather waiting to act on the defensive when assailed, and they remained silent. The bishop again asked them—

"What matter was it that occasioned their difficulty in the Catholic Faith."

Edith felt she could no longer remain silent, and said—"Indeed, my lord, there are a great many subjects which have caused us both uneasiness, and have compelled us to take a part we were most reluctant to take, and which, I fear, is likely to bring us into great trouble; but, if it be the Lord's will, we cannot help or avoid it."

"My dear," said the bishop, "there is no reason why you should fall into trouble if you will only listen to instruction and advice in a teachable spirit, and not set up your own private fallible judgment against the voice of the Church."

"But, how," my lord, "can I abjure my reason, and the common sense which God has given me to be my guide to regulate my path in life, and yet believe what I know to be an impossibility, and a contradiction to plain language and to common sense, and the direct testimony of Scripture, because the Church says it is so?"

"Miss Marley, you forget that the last words of our departing Saviour's commission to his apostles were, that they should go forth teaching all things, whatsoever he had commanded them; 'and, behold,' he says, 'I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' This is the warrant under which the bishops and pastors of Christ's Church, as the successors of the Apostles, now act. How, then, can the Catholic Church go astray?"

"No, my lord, certainly not so long as they teach those things which Christ commanded; but, if any particular body of Christian teachers have departed from the things commanded by Christ, and teach other things, it is plain we must look for the Church of which Christ speaks elsewhere, and that they are not the successors of the apostles on whom the commission has devolved."

"My dear, you seem to assume that the Holy Catholic

* The word "convenire" is now, by most Romish theologians, taken in the sense of "to agree," or "conform." The meaning "to resort," which some contend for, seems hardly reconcileable with fact or probability.